

**Administrative - Internal Use Only**

28 MAR 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM : Chairman, ADMAG

SUBJECT: Minutes of ADMAG Meeting, 19 March 1979

1. Attendance: The meeting was called to order at approximately 1500. In attendance were:

Alan S. - OL  
Richard W. - ODP  
Bill M. - OF  
Don W. - OL  
Mike R. - OS

2. Minutes: The minutes of the 26 February 1979 meeting were accepted with one correction: Bill M. has been omitted from the list of attendees.

STATINTL

3. DDA: [REDACTED], the EO/DDA indicated that Mr. Wortman, would not be able to attend this meeting because of other commitments. Because of the difficulty in scheduling the DDA, it was suggested that ADMAG would make itself available at the DDA's convenience for a special meeting. [REDACTED] indicated he would try to set up such a special ADMAG meeting.

STATINTL

4. Cover: Bill M. (OF rep) invited Hank S. from Central Cover Staff (CCS) for a discussion of the cover "disbenefits" memo. (Memo to ADMAG, from a cover employee, Subject: ADMAG Consideration of the Effects of Living Under Cover, dtd 8 June 1977). A paraphrase of CCS rep's comments on the benefit curtailments referenced in the above memo follows:

- a. It is true that dependents of employees under cover may not participate in the summer employment program.

**Administrative - Internal Use Only**

- b. Cover employees may be reimbursed for college courses but, they may not attend those offered at Agency facilities.
- c. Cover employees may participate in EAA activities that do not publically associate them with the Agency (primarily inside activities, clubs, EAA store, etc.)
- d. Cover employees probably have fewer restrictions on foreign travel when compared with their Agency [REDACTED] colleagues. STATINTL  
STATINTL
- e. (From cover letter to memo) The Savings Bond program is not available to cover employees. The CCS rep referred us to OF for clarification as to why this could not be arranged through cover organizations.
- f. Also discussed, (but not referenced in memo to ADMAG), limitations on insurance programs available to cover employees (see hospital insurance below).

On the other side of the coin, the CCS rep indicated that qualification for participation in CIARDS could certainly be considered a major cover benefit. (Though cover is not an absolute requirement for CIARDS, it certainly increases the individuals chances for overseas service and participation). ADMAG members present agreed with the CCS rep that any evaluation of benefits and disadvantages is very complex and not clean cut. A strong argument could be made that the CIARDS benefit overwhelms all disadvantages. This being the case it was the collective judgement of the members present that further pursuing the cover issue would not be profitable. It was, however, agreed by all present that employees entering cover status should be made fully aware of the situation. The CCS rep indicated that this was the case.

5. Dental Insurance: The chairman reported on a conversation with OP, following up on OP's memo to ADMAG on the dental insurance question. OP indi-

Administrative - Internal Use Only

cated that conversations with the carrier would take place in May and dental insurance would be discussed. OP was of the opinion that employee costs would again prove to be prohibitive. (The Office of Personnel Management, formerly CSC, has precluded any increase in government contributions to insurance plans). As requested by ADMAG, OP indicated that an employee notice would be circulated on this subject.

6. Hospital Insurance: The OP response on the hospital insurance problem was discussed (i.e., certain hospital's will not except directly any plans other than Blue Cross/Blue Shield for emergency room services). ADMAG members felt that an employee notice to this effect should be circulated. The nature of ADMAG's reply to OP will be formulated at the next meeting.

7. DDA Internal Communication: The DDA internal communication problem was discussed. It was agreed that this was an important one and the chairman should attempt to find a speaker on the topic. The DDA communication problem was further highlighted by some comments made by the CCS rep. He stated that field staff was recently informed of potential changes to dependent travel and death benefits for overseas personnel. ADMAG members present who might be effected in the future by the changes were not aware of them.

8. Snow Dismissal Policy: The OF rep, Bill M. made recommendations on changes to the [REDACTED] on snow dismissal policies. Specifically, he requested the curtailment of the D/OP authority to dismiss personnel in outlying areas (e.g. Langley). It was felt that this created an inequity since Rosslyn and D. C. personnel are covered by government-wide OPM (formerly CSC) regulations. This created, he believed, a good deal of resentment during the recent snow emergencies. The majority of ADMAG members, however, were not in agreement that D/OP's authority should be curtailed. All ADMAG members were in agreement that a Headquarters notice clarifying snow emergency procedures should be issued each winter. The OF rep agreed to draft a memo to D/OP for further discussion at the next meeting.

STATINTL

STATINTL

Administrative - Internal Use Only

Administrative - Internal Use Only

9. Ames Building Vending Machine Service: Don W., the OL rep is following the Ames Building situation for OL and was able to provide background information. Canteen Corporation, the current vendor, was selected by GSA. Currently, an OL staff member is auditing Canteen performance. Initial impressions are that they are improving and servicing the site at least once between 0900-1200 daily. In addition, OL recently requested FPO's to maintain a \$5 kitty (from Canteen) to reimburse employees who lose money. The FPO's balked after a short trial period at keeping the kitty but were willing to maintain a list of employees, so that Canteen can contact and reimburse them. The OC rep, Alan S., suggested that envelopes be provided through FPO's such that employees could self-address the envelope and fill out a form indicating the problem. The Canteen representative could then reimburse them by office mail, minimizing any inconvenience. Don W., agreed to follow up on this suggestion.

10. DCI/MAG and ADMAG Relationship and Career Intelligence Medals: The chairman informed the members that the relationship with the DCI/MAG was practically non-existent. From a DCI/MAG member it was learned that the suggestion on Career Intelligence Medal availability for executive secretaries had been forwarded by the DCI/MAG to the responsible parties. (ADMAG had received a copy of the original which was addressed to the DCI/MAG). The chairman will follow this up and report at the next meeting.

11. Work Order Prioritization: A memo from OL rep, Don W., on work order prioritization was distributed to the members (for members who were absent a copy is attached). Apparently, only NFAC does this on a directorate basis and most offices do not prioritize even on the office level. The lack of prioritization impedes the efficient delivery of the requested services. ADMAG members agreed to question component support officers as to how they are handling work orders. This will be discussed at the next meeting.

12. Next Meeting: The next planned meeting will be 16 April 1979 at 1500 in the DDA Conference Room

Administrative - Internal Use Only

Administrative - Internal Use Only

(7D32). A representative from OL will speak to the ADMAG on the space problem.



Chairman, ADMAG  
Acting Recorder

STATINTL

Administrative - Internal Use Only

MEMO FOR: DDA  
D/OP

Subject: Weather Emergencies

1. During the past winter there were several occasions when the provisions of **25X1A** ~~██████████~~ <sup>COPY ATTACHED</sup> were implemented but not carried out in the prescribed manner stated in this Handbook. This situation caused great confusion, loss of work time, questions on the reporting of absenteeism and in some quarters heated controversy on the fairness of the regulation.

2. As an example of the above, the following questions were most commonly asked:

a) The news broadcasted that "code two was in effect for all Govt workers," but what does code two mean? Code one? Code three, etc?

b) Again from <sup>the</sup> news ~~xxx~~, "only essential employees must report for duty." Who are considered essential?

c) What is meant by "a liberal leave policy" is in effect?

d) Why, when ~~██████████~~ was implemented, was the dismissal **25X1A** schedule not followed?

e) When an essential employee reports or stays on duty when others have been dismissed during his/her normal tour of duty, is that employee entitled to overtime? Compensatory time?

3. The ADMAG has discussed the above at great length and have come to the conclusion that the answers to the above questions come from wide enough sources that they should be consolidated into one paper. We envision this as an employee bulletin prepared at the beginning of each winter season (the beginning of most frequent use of the section) reviewing these ~~EM~~ emergency and reporting procedures.

4. While there was unanimous approval by AD MAG of the above, the same can not be said for the discussions of ~~██████████~~. The controversy stemmed from a recommendation, mainly from the Rosslyn area, that paragraph (c) be eliminated. **25X1A**  
The Rosslyn employees felt that (a) as the direct air distance between D.C. and Langley is so small (less than 1 mile) that the weather in one area would most assuredly be the same in the other area. b) if the reason for the early dismissal is so employees

can safely return to their homes, how can the Rosslyn employees who live in Virginia be excluded when some must pass through Langley to get to their homes? (c) Why isn't there a provision for severe weather conditions in ~~the~~ D.C. and Rosslyn that would not affect the Langley area? and (d) there is a disruption in car pools, which ~~is~~ overflows at an ~~un~~opportune time on to public transportation.

5. The majority of AD MAG agreed ~~ed~~ that paragraph (c) should be retained in its present form. However, it should also be noted that the majority of members are not from the Rosslyn area.

26 March 1979

Rich,

Thank you for presenting my complaint about the non-acceptance of Age insurance cards in D.C. hospitals. I read the OP reply with dismay.

My complaint had to do with the way Sibley (and apparently other hospitals) do not honor the AGE card in their emergency/out-patient wards. Only Paragraph 2 of the OP letter dealt with this problem, i.e., that hospitals in the D.C. area regularly refuse to honor the AGE card in their emergency/out-patient wards. While I am happy that my complaint was confirmed by OP, I was distressed by the implied conclusion that this dishonor is a way of the world not to be challenged.

I searched the letter for solutions. There were none. Have we, for example, braced the local hospital hierarchy and told them that, by God, they will not ignore our legitimate hospital cards for which our members pay full value for services they are not, in fact, getting? If it is, as the Sibley registrar told me, that the AGE card is not honored because of slowness of payments and attendant administrative burdens, what actions have been taken to correct these discrepancies? Or, if honor cannot be regained by internal reform, what offsetting reductions in premiums have been arranged?

In summary: What corrective actions are under way? What is being done to eliminate discrimination against employees who are required to use AGE solely as a concomitant of cover, cover which is maintained in the interest of the Agency, not the individual? What is the solution? I already know what the problem is.

*Dick*  
Dick